



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,893	09/29/2006	Daniel Kopf	120391	8707
25944 7590 09/25/2009 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
HAGAN, SEAN P				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2828				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/25/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/581,893

**Applicant(s)**

KOPF ET AL.

**Examiner**

SEAN HAGAN

**Art Unit**

2828

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 through 12 originally filed 6 June 2006. Claims 1 through 11 presented as amended sheet of claims 6 June 2006. Claims 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11 amended by second amendment filed 6 June 2006. Claims 1 through 10 amended by amendment filed 5 July 2006. Claim 11 cancelled by amendment filed 5 July 2006. Claims 12 through 19 added by amendment filed 5 July 2006. Claims 1 through 10 and 11 through 18 amended by amendment received 13 February 2009. Claim 20 added by amendment received 13 February 2009. Claim 1 amended by amendment entered with RCE received 17 August 2009. Claims 21 through 23 added by amendment entered with RCE received 17 August 2009. Claims 1 through 10 and 12 through 23 are pending in this application.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered; they are not persuasive.
3. Applicants amend claim 1 to include limitations directed to the power output of the laser device and argue that, since the prior art fails to positively recite achievement of the claimed power level, the limitations overcome the prior art. Examiner notes that the optical processes established to be known in the prior art appear to be the only optical processes of the present invention. It has also not been established that the elements required for the operation of the device are incapable of high power output, only that the prior art fails to disclose a maximum operational power. Since there is no

indication that the achievement of high power is in any way unexpected, there appears to be no reason that a system according to the prior art would be incapable of the claimed high power output. As such, these limitations appear to amount to adjustment of known parameters and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272,205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

4. As such, all claims are addressed as follows:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 12, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, and 23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dahm (US Patent 5,848,080) in view of Delfyett (US Patent 5,265,107).

7. ***Regarding claim 1***, Dahm discloses, "An amplifying laser medium" (col. 4, lines 6-9). "A laser resonator with at least one resonator mirror" (col. 4, lines 6-9). "At least one cavity dumping component" (col. 5, lines 55-58). "A pump source for pumping the laser medium" (col. 4, lines 46-51). "Wherein the cavity dumping component is an electro-optical modulator" (col. 4, lines 28-45). Dahm does not disclose, "A saturable absorber mirror." Delfyett discloses, "A saturable absorber mirror" (col. 1, lines 35-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Dahm with the teachings of Delfyett. Introduction of a saturable absorber mirror as taught by Delfyett would enhance the teachings of Dahm by facilitation of mode locking conditions at a short pulse rate (Delfyett, col. 4, lines 22-25).

8. The combination of Dahm and Delfyett does not disclose, "The laser system is configured to generate femtosecond or picosecond pulses with a repetition rate greater than 10kHz and a peak pulse power greater than 100kW." It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to adjust the pulse characteristics within the parameters of known optical equipment to achieve a desired power output, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272,205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

9. **Regarding claim 2**, Dahm discloses, "Wherein the electro-optical modulator is a BBO cell" (col. 4, lines 28-45).

10. **Regarding claim 7**, Dahm discloses, "Wherein the laser medium is ytterbium-doped glass or Nd:YVO4 " (col. 4, lines 6-9).

11. **Regarding claim 8**, the combination of Dahm and Delfyett does not disclose, "Wherein the laser medium comprises ytterbium-doped tungstates." It would have been

an obvious matter of design choice to use KGW or KYW as host material, since applicant has not disclosed that this difference solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the difference.

12. **Regarding claim 10**, Dahm discloses, "The pump light spot consisting of a single ray or the combination of a plurality of rays" (col. 4, lines 46-51).

13. The combination of Dahm and Delfyett does not disclose, "Wherein the pump source is formed and is arranged in such a way that a pump light spot having a ratio of length to width of at least 2:1 is formed." It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to design the pump medium to have a ratio of length to width of 2:1, since applicant has not disclosed that this difference solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the difference.

14. **Regarding claim 12**, Dahm discloses, "Wherein the pump source is a laser diode source" (col. 4, lines 46-51).

15. **Regarding claim 17**, the combination of Dahm and Delfyett does not disclose, "Wherein the laser medium comprises Yb:KGW or Yb:KYW." It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use KGW or KYW as host material, since applicant

has not disclosed that this difference solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the difference.

16. **Regarding claim 18**, Dahm discloses, "Wherein pump light consists of the combination of a plurality of rays" (col. 4, lines 46-51). "The rays being generated by laser diodes" (col. 4, lines 46-51).

17. **Regarding claim 20**, Dahm does not disclose, "Wherein the repetition rate is greater than 100kHz." Delfyett discloses, "Wherein the repetition rate is greater than 100kHz" (col. 4, lines 12-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Dahm with the teachings of Delfyett for the reasons provided above regarding claim 1.

18. **Regarding claim 21**, the combination of Dahm and Delfyett does not disclose, "Wherein the laser system is configured to generate the pulses with a pulse energy above 100nJ." It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to adjust the pulse characteristics within the parameters of known optical equipment to achieve a desired power output, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272,205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

19. **Regarding claim 22**, the combination of Dahm and Delfyett does not disclose, "Wherein the laser system is configured to generate the pulses with a peak pulse power greater than 1MW." It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to adjust the pulse characteristics within the parameters of known optical equipment to achieve a desired power output, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272,205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

20. **Regarding claim 23**, the combination of Dahm and Delfyett does not disclose, "Wherein the laser system is configured to generate the pulses with a pulse energy above 400nJ." It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to adjust the pulse characteristics within the parameters of known optical equipment to achieve a desired power output, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272,205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

21. Claims 3 and 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dahm in view of Delfyett and further in view of Dell'Acqua et al. (Dell'Acqua, US Pub. 2005/0152426).

22. **Regarding claim 3**, the combination of Dahm and Delfyett does not disclose, "Wherein the electro-optical modulator is an RTP cell." Dell'Acqua discloses, "Wherein



the electro-optical modulator is an RTP cell" (p. [0091], lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of the combination of Dahm and Delyett with the teachings of Dell'Acqua. The use of RTP electro optical modulator as Q-switch as disclosed by Dell'Acqua would have been suitable for use with the teachings of Dahm and Delyett. The selection of something based on its known suitability for its intended use has been held to support a prima facie case of obviousness. *Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp.*, 325 U.S. 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945).

23. **Regarding claim 13**, the combination of Dahm and Delyett does not disclose, "Wherein the RTP cell comprises a component for compensating thermal drift." Dell'Acqua discloses, "Wherein the RTP cell comprises a component for compensating thermal drift" (p. [0092], lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of the combination of Dahm and Delyett with the teachings of Dell'Acqua for the reasons provided above regarding claim 3.

24. Claims 4 and 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dahm in view of Delyett and further in view of Duguay et al. (Duguay, US Patent 3,675,154).

25. **Regarding claim 4**, the combination of Dahm and Delfyett does not disclose, "At least one dispersive mirror for dispersion compensation." Duguay discloses, "At least one dispersive mirror for dispersion compensation" (col. 1, lines 46-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of the combination of Dahm and Delfyett with the teachings of Duguay. The inclusion of dispersion compensation as disclosed by Duguay would enhance the teachings of Dahm and Delfyett by allowing reduction of pulse width of optical pulses (Duguay, col. 1, lines 38-42).

26. **Regarding claim 14**, the combination of Dahm and Delfyett does not disclose, "Wherein the at least one dispersive mirror for dispersion compensation is a Gires-Tournois interferometer." Duguay discloses, "Wherein the at least one dispersive mirror for dispersion compensation is a Gires-Tournois interferometer" (col. 1, lines 46-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of the combination of Dahm and Delfyett with the teachings of Duguay for the reasons given above regarding claim 4.

27. Claims 5 and 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dahm in view of Delfyett in view of Duguay and further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA).

28. **Regarding claim 5**, the combination of Dahm, Delfyett, and Duguay does not disclose, "Wherein the laser system is formed so that, in the generation of picosecond pulses, the nonlinear phase is less than 100 mrad." "The nonlinear phase being calculated per resonator cycle and per 1% modulation depth of the saturable absorber mirror." AAPA discloses, "Wherein the laser system is formed so that, in the generation of picosecond pulses, the nonlinear phase is less than 100 mrad" (pg. 12, lines 12-25). "The nonlinear phase being calculated per resonator cycle and per 1% modulation depth of the saturable absorber mirror" (pg. 12, lines 12-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of the combination of Dahm, Delfyett, and Duguay with the teachings of AAPA. Operating conditions presented for operation in applicant's admitted prior art would enhance the teachings of Dahm, Delfyett, and Duguay by improving stability conditions.

29. **Regarding claim 15**, the combination of Dahm, Delfyett, and Duguay does not disclose, "Wherein the nonlinear phase is less than 10 mrad." AAPA discloses, "Wherein the nonlinear phase is less than 10 mrad" (pg. 12, lines 12-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of the combination of Dahm, Delfyett, and Duguay with the teachings of AAPA. Operating conditions presented for operation in applicant's admitted prior art would enhance the teachings of the combination of Dahm, Delfyett and Duguay by improving stability conditions.

30. Claims 6, 16, and 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dahm in view of Delfyett and further in view of AAPA.

31. **Regarding claim 6**, the combination of Dahm and Delfyett does not disclose, "Wherein the laser system is formed so that, in the generation of femtosecond pulses, the  $r$  parameter is less than 1." AAPA discloses, "Wherein the laser system is formed so that, in the generation of femtosecond pulses, the  $r$  parameter is less than 1" (pg. 7, lines 6-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of the combination of Dahm and Delfyett with the teachings of AAPA. Operating conditions presented for operation in applicant's admitted prior art would enhance the teachings of Dahm and Delfyett by improving stability conditions.

32. **Regarding claim 16**, the combination of Dahm and Delfyett does not disclose, "Wherein the  $r$  parameter is less than 0.25." AAPA discloses, "Wherein the  $r$  parameter is less than 0.25" (pg. 12, lines 12-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of the combination of Dahm and Delfyett with the teachings of AAPA. Operating conditions presented for operation in applicant's admitted prior art would enhance the teachings of Dahm and Delfyett by improving stability conditions.

33. **Regarding claim 19**, the combination of Dahm and Delfyett does not disclose, "Providing a material to be processed by plasma generation." "Processing the material using the high-repetition mode-coupled ultra-short pulse laser system of claim 1." AAPA discloses, "Providing a material to be processed by plasma generation" (pg. 1, lines 11-20). "Processing the material using the high-repetition mode-coupled ultra-short pulse laser system of claim 1" (pg. 1, lines 11-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of the combination of Dahm and Delfyett with the teachings of AAPA. Intended use for high speed laser devices as disclosed by applicant's admitted prior art would have been a suitable application for a device according to the teachings of Dahm and Delfyett. The selection of something based on its known suitability for its intended use has been held to support a prima facie case of obviousness. *Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp.*, 325 U.S. 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945).

34. Claim 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dahm in view of Delfyett and further in view of Powell et al. (Powell, US Patent 4,849,036).

35. **Regarding claim 9**, the combination of Dahm and Delfyett does not disclose, "Wherein the laser medium has a disc-like geometry." Powell discloses, "Wherein the laser medium has a disc-like geometry" (col. 1, lines 23-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of the combination of Dahm and Delfyett with the teachings of Powell. Laser

disk geometry as taught by Powell would have been suitable to use with the teachings of Dahm and Delfyett. The selection of something based on its known suitability for its intended use has been held to support a prima facie case of obviousness. *Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp.*, 325 U.S. 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945).

### ***Conclusion***

36. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SEAN HAGAN whose telephone number is (571)270-1242. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30 - 5:00.

37. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Minsun O. Harvey can be reached on 571-272-1835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

38. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. H./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2828

/Minsun Harvey/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2828